

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

By the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 10 and 11 have been amended. Claims 8 and 17 have been previously canceled. Thus, claims 1-7, 9-16, 18 and 19 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

In the Office Action mailed December 13, 2006, claims 1-7, 9-16, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e), as being anticipated by Wilson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,118,603, hereinafter, "Wilson"). It is noted that claims 1, 10 and 11 have been amended. To the extent that the rejection remains applicable to the claims currently pending, the Applicants hereby traverse the rejection, as follows.

In the Applicant's invention as recited in independent claims 1, 10 and 11, as amended, one "predetermined mark" is included in a series of data. Thus, by the claimed invention, it is possible to detect one predetermined for detecting synchronization.

Wilson does not disclose or suggest at least the combination of receiving a series of data including only one predetermined mark for detecting synchronization and generating parallel data from the series of data; and a plurality of detecting units being provided at each bit position of the parallel data, the detecting units being adapted to detect whether strings of bits of the parallel data corresponding to strings of bits of the series of data from each bit position of the parallel data as a starting point of the predetermined mark are the predetermined mark; wherein any one of the detecting units detects the starting point of the predetermined mark, as recited in claim 1, as amended.

Similarly, Wilson does not disclose or suggest a data processor for detecting only one predetermined mark for detecting synchronization that is included in a series of data read from a memory medium in order to establish synchronization at a time of transferring the series of data to a controller unit from a read channel unit, including at least the combination of a receiving unit for receiving the series of data including the predetermined mark for detecting synchronization and generating parallel data from the series of data; and a plurality of detecting units being provided at each bit position of the parallel data, the detecting units being adapted to detect whether strings of bits of the parallel data corresponding to strings of bits of the series of data from each bit position of the parallel data as a starting point of the predetermined mark are the predetermined mark; and wherein any one of the detecting units detects the starting point of the predetermined mark, as recited in claim 10, as amended.

Furthermore, Wilson does not disclose or suggest at least the combination of receiving a series of data including only one predetermined mark for detecting synchronization; generating parallel data from the series of data; detecting the predetermined mark for detecting synchronization from any one of strings of bits of the parallel data continuing from each bit position of the parallel data to establish synchronization of the series of data; and demodulating the series of data based on the predetermined mark for detecting synchronization detected from one of the bit strings, as recited in claim 11, as amended.

To qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single reference must teach, i.e., identically describe, each feature of a rejected claim. As explained above, Wilson neither discloses nor suggests each and every feature recited in independent claims 1,

10 and 11, as amended. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10 and 11 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Wilson.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10 and 11 are patentably distinct over Wilson and in condition for allowance.

As amended claims 1, 10 and 11 are allowable, the Applicant submits that claims 2-7, 9, 12-16, 18 and 19, each of which depends from one of allowable claims 1, 10 and 11, are likewise allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 10 and 11.

### **Conclusion**

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge

any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to  
Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing docket no. 024016-00008.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox, LLP



Michele L. Connell  
Registration No. 52,763

25,895

**Customer No. 004372**  
ARENT FOX PLLC  
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339  
Telephone No. (202) 857-6104  
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395

CMM/MLC

Enclosures: Petition for extension of time